THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

November 13, 1985

AM 11:30 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Administration of Oath of Office for new members: Carolyn Deaver, Roy M. Goodman, Pascal Regan and Diane Wolf

B. Dates of next meetings: December 11, 1985 (Wednesday)

January 15, 1986 (Wednesday)

February 12, 1986 (Wednesday)

March 12, 1986 (Wednesday)

C. Captain Peter Belin Award for distinguished service to the Georgetown Community, presented to the Commission of Fine Arts, November 12, 1985

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

Old Georgetown Act

1. O.G. 85-276, 907-30th Street, N. W., Rosewood Hotel and Office Building, request for approval of construction drawings.

Old Georgetown Act (continued)

2. O.G. 85-280, 3300 M Street, N.W., proposed new office and retail building, review of initial concept design.

3. Appendix I. Review of Old Georgetown Board recommendations.

Shipstead-Luce Act

1. S.L. 86-11, 3005 Oregon Street, N.W., proposed new single-family residence, request for approval of construction drawings.

2. S.L. 86-12, 3002 Oregon Street, N.W., proposed new single-family residence, request for approval of construction drawings.

3. S.L. 86-13, 2301 N Street, N. W., proposed new office/apartment building, review of revised concept design.

4. S.L. 86-17, 400 First Street, S.E., proposed sidewalk cafe enclosure.

5. S.L. 86-20, 5401 16th Street, N.W., the Buddhist Congregational Church of America, request for approval of construction drawings for a new entrance gate.

6. S.L. 86-21, 409 12th Street, S.W., proposed new office building, review of initial concept design.

7. Appendix II. Review of Staff recommendations.

B. District of Columbia Urban Renewal Authority

CFA 13/NOV/85-1, Phillips Flagship Restaurant, Maine Avenue, S.W., on the Washington Channel, alterations and additions to existing building; review of initial concept design.

C. Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers

CFA 13/NOV/85-2, Arlington Cemetery Visitors Center and Parking Facility; review of initial concept design.

D. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

1. CFA 13/NOV/85-3, Vietnam Veterans Medal, revised design for obverse side; inspection of plaster model.

2. CFA 13/NOV/85-4, Lady Bird Johnson Medal; inspection of plaster model for obverse side.

III. INSPECTIONS

A. General Services Administration

CFA 13/NOV/85-5, Pentagon Area Master Plan Studies; review of design alternatives in process at the offices of Keyes, Condon and Florance, Architects, 1320 19th Street, N. W.

B. Freer Gallery of Art

Inspection of proposed acquisitions.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

*	O.G. 85-255	3350 M Street, N. W. Forrest-Marbury House	Revised concept design for connecting bridge

ACTION: No objection to concept of two-level masonry bridge connecting upper stories of historic Forrest-Marbury House with new construction to the west. Note attached drawing of accepted scheme.

---

*	O.G. 85-272	3414 Prospect Street, N. W. Jack Y. Matthews	Curb-cut, excavation, renovation and addition: Conceptual

ACTION: Recommend against concept of curb-cut. New curb-cuts are not recommended for existing residential structures in the historic district. Commission notes that this residence retains last remaining original ground plane on block.

---

*	O.G. 85-278	1521 35th Street, N. W. Plake/Bryant Associates	Curb-cut and landscaping

ACTION: Recommend <u>against</u> issuance of permit. New curb-cuts are not recommended for existing residential structures in the historic district. Proposed curb-cut would have adverse impact on historic house, iron fencing and landscape setting as well as disrupt view along public space.

	O.G. 85-279	1511 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Gholamrezu Mottayhi	Store renovation

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit according to drawing received and dated 13 September 1985. Note changes shown in red ink as discussed with applicant and approved by Commission.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

O.G. 85-289	1206 30th Street, N. W. Thomas H. Price, III	Internally-illuminated sign

ACTION: Issuance of permit is not recommended. An internally-illuminated plastic sign is not appropriate to the historic district or this historic structure. Recommend submittal of bracket-mounted wood sign, approximately 30 in. wide by 40 in. high having graphics and lettering painted on surface.

O.G. 85-290	1517 30th Street, N. W. Dwight Shar	Addition of two dormers: Conceptual

ACTION: The concept of adding dormers to this individually-designated landmark residence is not recommended.

O.G. 86-01	1519 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. John Snyder & Sam Levy	Awning/sign

ACTION: Recommend issuance of permit for opaque, vinyl-clad, grey-colored awning with white lettering on eight inch valance.

O.G. 86-04	1070½ 31st St., N. W. Hyo Y. Whang	Renovation to existing commercial building.

ACTION: Recommend issuance of permit for altering existing garage openings for windows. Existing entrance door and adjacent window will remain. Note changes marked in red on submitted drawing as approved by applicant. Changes require larger window area with small panes of glass divided by wood muntins. Muntins not to exceed 1" in width.

O.G. 86-05	1413 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Angelo A. Puglisi	Awning refurbishment

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for black and white-striped shed awning having a white valance with black lettering.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

O.G. 86-08	3029 M Street, N. W. Fred Maroon	Signs & lighting: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of horizontal sign attached to shopfront cornice or to banner sign at second floor. Working drawings should include a more discreet form of lighting than previously submitted.

O.G. 86-09	1313 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. John Jr. & MG. Snyder	Storefront remodeling: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of storefront remodeling as shown on drawings received and dated 22 October 1985. Submit working drawings to the Commission of Fine Arts for approval when ready.

O.G. 86-13	3323 Q Street, N. W. Goulden-Smith	Conversion of garage

ACTION: Project determined not to be visible from public space.

O.G. 86-14	1201 34th Street, N. W. Louis G. Heon	Enclose side yard of former Cellar Door

ACTION: Recommend issuance of permit for proposed side yard enclosure including new entrance door, sky-lighted, permanent roof, and restoration of second floor porch.

O.G. 86-17	1521 35th Street, N. W. Togu Julu	Rear addition

ACTION: Recommend issuance of permit for the proposed gallery and one story kitchen additions to rear of existing residence. The Commission notes that proposed work does not entail a curb-cut and that no changes to the street front and grounds are intended.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

Staff Recommendations as delegated by Old Georgetown Board.

O.G. 86-06 — 3600 -3672 Winfield Lane, N. W. The Cloisters — New Townhouses

ACTION: Recommend issuance of permit for proposed new townhouses as shown on supplemental drawings received and dated 4 November 1985.

O.G. 86-07 — 3600-3644 Reservoir Road, N. W. The Cloisters — New Townhouses

ACTION: Recommend issuance of permit for proposed new townhouses as shown on supplemental drawings received and dated 4 November 1985.

ACTIONS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF UNDER THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 85-92	2121 Park Road, N.W. John D. Rockefeller, IV	Property wall and gates

ACTION: Recommend issuance of permit for proposed brick and stone property walls and entrance piers with iron gates.

	NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
*	S.L. 85-105	5401 16th Street, N.W. Buddhist Congregational Church of America	Final plans for a church building

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of a permit for the proposed pre-fabricated church building only. Request submission of proposed landscaping, property fences and walls, parking facilities, and most especially, the entrance gateway from Sixteenth Street, when applicants are ready to proceed on this phase.

	NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
*	S.L. 85-107	2215 Constitution Avenue, N.W. American Pharmaceutical Association	Roof deck

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit. Proposed roof deck will not be visible from public space.

	NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
*	S.L. 85-108	2215 Constitution Avenue, N.W. American Pharmaceutical Association	Relandscaping, new terraces, curb-cut: Conceptual

ACTION: Recommend against concept of curb-cut at Constitution Avenue. No objections to proposed design concepts for terraces and restoration of landscaping. Submit final plans and materials for approval of CFA prior to issuance of permit.

ACTIONS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF UNDER THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
* S.L. 85-110	2301 N Street, N.W. Boston Properties	New office and apartment buildings: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of multi-use development. However, proposed siting, bulk and character should be restudied. Xerox copies of the transcript have been sent to the developer and the architect.

S.L. 85-115	2401 M Street, N.W. Westin Hotel	Awnings

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for canvas-covered steel frame awnings as proposed in submitted application received and dated 17 September 1985.

S.L. 86-7	2121 Park Road, N.W. John D. Rockefeller, IV	Garden terraces and entrance court

ACTION: Recommend issuance of permit for proposed masonry and stone garden terraces and entrance court.

S.L. 86-8	1776 D Street, N.W. DAR	New service door

ACTION: Recommend issuance of permit for replacement of existing service door with window and existing window with new service door. New materials and details will match existing.

S.L. 86-14	51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W. Louis G. Heon	New side entrance

ACTION: Recommend issuance of permit for new side entrance and stair. Proposed work will match existing materials and details as shown on drawings received and dated 1 November 1985.

ACTIONS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF UNDER THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-15	4th & F street, N.W. (The Dubliner)	Removable entrance vestibule

ACTION: Recommend issuance of permit for removable, wood and glass vestibule as shown on drawings received and dated 1 November 1985.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

13 November 1985

The meeting was convened at 11:30 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Members present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. Carolyn Deaver Hon. Roy M. Goodman Hon. Frederick E. Hart Hon. Pascal Regan Hon. Diane Wolf
Staff present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue Kohler
National Capital Planning Commission staff present:	

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Administration of Oath of Office for new members: Carolyn Deaver, Roy M. Goodman, Pascal Regan and Diane Wolf. The oath of office was administered by the Secretary, and the Chairman welcomed the new members to the Commission.

B. Dates of next meetings: The dates for the next four meetings were set as follows: 11 December 1985 (Wednesday), 15 January 1986 (Wednesday), 20 February 1986 (Thursday), and 20 March 1986 (Thursday). The last two dates differed from those on the printed agenda.

C. Captain Peter Belin Award for distinguished service to the Georgetown Community, presented to the Commission of Fine Arts, 12 November 1985. The Secretary noted that Captain Belin had been a great supporter of historic preservation; he said this award, presented by the Citizens Association of Georgetown, had been accepted by former Commission member Alan Novak, with a speech at the Association's meeting.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

Old Georgetown Act

1. O.G. 85-276, 907 30th Street, N. W., Rosewood Hotel and office building, request for approval of construction drawings. The Chairman briefed the new members on the function of the Georgetown Board, and then the Assistant Secretary pointed out the site for this project on an aerial photograph; he noted that the members had visited it on their orientation tour of the city preceding the meeting. He told them that the project was part of a complicated transfer of land and easements between the National Park Service and the District of Columbia which included provision for a waterfront park and public access to the waterfront bordering the private development. He said the landscape plan developed for this site involved both Park Service and private land. The architect, Arthur Cotton Moore, was then introduced to review the design of the project for the new members. He showed slides of the area and drawings of the original and final designs for both buildings, reviewing the reduction in height and mass and other design changes that had resulted from Commission review.

The Chairman told the new members that the purpose of this submission was to confirm what had already been approved. He questioned the staff about the working drawings, and the Secretary said they conformed to those seen previously by the Commission, adding that the final selection of materials was yet to come. The members then unanimously approved the construction drawings. Exhibits A, A-1

2. O.G. 85-280, 3300 M Street, N.W., proposed new office and retail building, review of initial concept design. The Assistant Secretary noted that the members had seen the site for this project on their pre-meeting tour. He showed a model of the proposed building at the corner of 33rd and M Streets; the model included the existing buildings along M Street west to the Forrest-Marbury house and south along 33rd Street. He said that the Georgetown Board had reviewed the design three times and was now recommending it for design development; a written report from the Board was given to each member. He said the Board's hope was that the new building would provide a suitable anchor for the corner and be compatible with the small-scale 19th century buildings along the block. He noted also that there had been some concern about the development from an adjacent property owner on 33rd Street south of the public alley.

Mr. Kvell of Kvell/Corcoran, architects, was then introduced. He said the row of small two-story houses on M Street had been the most important consideration in formulating the design for the new building.

He thought the tower element would act as an anchor at the 33rd Street corner as the Forrest-Marbury house did at the western end of the M Street row. As the new building would face a row of three story buildings across the street, he did not think the extra height would be a problem. The height on M Street would be under thirty feet, although zoning would allow sixty. As a further concession to the M Street houses, their texture and window pattern had been kept in mind when working out the fenestration for the new building. The tower would be set back to allow more sidewalk area on 33rd Street. It was noted that the adjacent owner on 33rd Street had complained that owing to the narrowness of the alley, the truck access next to his building was not adequate. Mr. Kvell said he had set the building back an extra 4 feet from the alley and thought that would be enough to eliminate any difficulties. Mr. Courts Oulihan, the attorney representing the adjacent property owner, said he was satisfied with this but had another problem with the design. He said that since the site sloped down along 33rd Street, the building became excessively high at its south corner and dwarfed the old buildings south of it. Mr. Goodman asked Mr. Kvell if he had a comment on that observation. Mr. Kvell said he had given up height at the corner just so that he would avoid this problem; he noted that the rear of the building was only 37 feet at its highest point. He also pointed out, in connection with the discussion of the 33rd Street facade, that the strong line of the stone base would help keep the building from appearing to slide down the hill. He noted that in addition to the stone base, other materials expected to be used were brick for the body of the building and metal (standing seam) for the roof. The members then discussed other aspects of the 33rd Street facade, including a tall, narrow stair window in the middle, flanked by a door and a window. There was criticism of the confusing design of the window; the upper part was used only to give light to a recessed basement skylight. From the drawings, it seemed to Miss Wolf that there might be some confusion as to which opening was the door and which the window. Mr. Kvell said the window was actually much higher off the ground than it appeared, and the door was a minor entrance, leading only to second floor office areas. The main entrance would be at the tower either into the main floor or by an exterior recessed stair to the basement level. Mr. Hart criticized the lack of any decorative elements. Mr. Kvell said the copper downspouts on either side of the stair window would add a decorative touch because of their color; also, as they were carried back into the building above ground level they would terminate in a copper scupper that could have an ornamental quality--much like those commonly used on Victorian buildings. The Chairman was concerned about the recessed horizontal areas over the windows (intended for signs), feeling that they made the brick above look unsupported. Mr. Kvell said the vertical window elements could be carried up through the sign area and corbelled out to avoid this. The Chairman commented that the area south of M Street had always had an industrial character and it was important to differentiate between this area and the residential section

to the north. He said the important thing was to strike a balance between the two, and he commended the developer for being willing to give up a considerable amount of space in order to make this happen. There were no objections to the overall design concept, but Mr. Kvell was asked to restudy the basement window on 33rd Street adjacent to the stair window and the recessed sign area, as well as details of the basement entrance stair on the corner. Exhibit A

3. Appendix I. Review of Old Georgetown Board recommendations. There were no objections and the recommendations were approved.

Shipstead-Luce Act

1. S.L. 86-11, 3005 Oregon Street, N. W., proposed new single-family residence, request for approval of construction drawings.

2. S.L. 86-12, 3002 Oregon Street, N. W., proposed new single-family residence, request for approval of construction drawings.

Before discussion of this project, the Chairman reviewed the Shipstead-Luce Act for the new members, noting that its purpose was to protect the monumental core of Washington, and Rock Creek Park, from unsuitable development. The Secretary pointed out the boundaries on a map, and the members were informed that there was currently a movement to enlarge these boundaries slightly.

Staff member Jeffrey Carson then reviewed the Commission's previous actions on this project, saying that it had been seen in various stages over the past two years. He pointed out the location, in upper northwest Washington just west of Rock Creek Park, and showed slides of the hilly site, the already completed contemporary brick houses and the "Victorian" frame houses now under construction. He said the frame houses were similar to what was being submitted at this meeting. Mr. Carson showed a site plan, pointing out the built and unbuilt houses, and drawings of those now under construction. He then introduced Robert Jeffers, the owner of one of the brick houses and chairman of the development's homeowners' association. Mr. Jeffers explained that there were twenty lots in the development and said the homeowners' association had an architectural review board to approve the design of new houses as they were built. He said his group had not known about the proposal to build these two new houses and wanted the Commission to defer its action until they had had a chance to review them. He said they had gone to litigation over the frame houses now under construction and were successful in getting the developer to change the design and use wood shingles, some masonry elements and a siding color that would make them more compatible with the existing houses. But, he said, the houses were not built according to the approved drawings and he wanted to be sure this wouldn't happen again. Mr. Carson said the appropriate District agency had been contacted

about the matter, and it was now the staff's opinion that the Commission should go ahead and review the design of the new houses and leave Mr. Jeffers, the developer and the District government to work out the problems with the houses now under construction.

The Chairman asked what would be involved if the Commission deferred its action until the December meeting. Mr. Carson suggested that the developer, Steven Flannigan from the Tidewater Construction Company, would like to comment on that. Mr. Flannigan was introduced and said any delay would cause him financial hardship because it would push delivery time much further into the future and discourage those now interested in buying the houses. He said he thought the difficulties with Mr. Jeffers had been solved by the litigation. The Chairman suggested that one option would be to let the permit process go ahead, notifying the District government that the design was subject to final review at the December meeting. He said it was encouraging that the neighbors were interested in design and compatibility, but he noted that the Commission's interest in the design might vary from the neighbors' interest, in that the Commission was concerned primarily with the effect these houses would have on the park. He added that the Commission felt strongly that all construction should proceed in accordance with the approved drawings. Mr. Jeffers and Mr. Flannigan were satisfied with the Chairman's suggestion regarding the permit process, and the other members agreed that this would be the way to proceed.

Exhibits A, A-2

3. S.L. 86-13, 2301 N Street, N. W., proposed new office/apartment building, review of revised concept design. Mr. Carson told the members that this was the second submission of a conceptual scheme for a multi-use building directly east of Georgetown, bordering Rock Creek Park. He said the first submission was for separate buildings, differing in style and character, to house the office and residential functions. The Chairman told the new members that the Commission had difficulty with two strongly vertical buildings in this critical park location, and thought, too, that they did not relate well to the new, curved gateway ending of 24th Street and the two buildings designed by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill that flank the curved open space. The architect, Alan Lockman, was then introduced to discuss his new concept design.

Mr. Lockman said he thought the Commission's points were well taken, and he hoped he had responded to them with this new design. He showed drawings of a single building with a horizontal emphasis, tapered down at both ends, but particularly at the gateway location. Balconies had been retained in the residential section, but the large glazed atria, objected to by the Commission, had been removed. The height was approximately the same as the first submission: about 65 feet. Mr. Lockman also pointed out a change in the driveway entrance to the garage. Then he asked to discuss a landscaping proposal that would enhance the gateway

concept north of N Street, along the 24th Street visual right-of-way; this was not part of the submission. He said his firm had retained EDAW, landscape architects, to do a preliminary scheme, but cautioned that the approval of many agencies would be needed before it could become a reality. Russell Hannah from EDAW discussed the proposal. He said the plan would help tie together the new building and the low junior high school building across the 24th Street continuation (now an alley) to the west. It would begin as a tree-lined urban street at N Street leading to a circular paved turn-around in front of entrances to the school and new multi-use building, and then become a strictly pedestrian area, widening out and becoming more informal as it ended in the park. The members were not asked to comment on the landscaping at this point, but they unanimously agreed that the revised concept design for the multi-use building was much better than the original submission, and it was approved. Exhibit A

4. S.L. 86-17, 400 First Street, S. E., proposed sidewalk cafe enclosure. Mr. Carson told the members that this site was in the Capitol Interest District, which meant that it came under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol; he pointed out the location, one and one-half blocks south of the Capitol and House buildings. He showed photographs of the existing condition: an awning erected out over public space, under which were placed chairs and tables for cafe use during warm weather. He said the restaurant would now like to enclose approximately this same area with glass panels which could be removed, following District regulations, during good weather. Mr. Anton, the restaurant owner, was introduced to discuss his plans. He said he thought the appearance would be improved by the glass, and in answer to a question, said he would keep it up during the winter and in the hottest months of the summer, when the space would be air conditioned. When asked about the problem of heat coming through the glass roof, he said it would have a silver heat resistant treatment and there would also be internal shading devices. The Chair- asked the Secretary to review the Commission's general policy toward enclosed sidewalk cafes. Mr. Atherton said the Commission had always stressed that an open feeling should be kept and no important views obstructed. He said the use of awnings had generally been preferred because of their festive character. He added that if heat resistant glass were used in an installation such as the one proposed, the open feeling would be diminished. He said he had consulted with the Architect of the Capitol's office, and the feeling of that office and the Commission staff was that the awning should be retained and glass panels brought up to it, or an awning could be put over the glass roof.

Miss Wolf said she was familiar with the block on which the restaurant was located and thought that it had an airy, festive feeling about it, noting that other restaurants used umbrellas on their sidewalk space. Mr. Hart commented that he did not like to see commercial

establishments allowed to enclose public space and narrow the sidewalks excessively. He said he would not object to an open cafe that would add vitality to the street, but could not approve what would amount to an addition to a building. The Chairman suggested to Mr. Anton that he take these comments and recommendations and work out a solution with the staff that would keep the awning and allow clear glass panels on the sides to be used during inclement weather only. He added that the clear glass enclosure could actually add vitality to the street during the winter. The other members agreed that this would be satisfactory, as did Mr. Anton. Exhibit A

5. S.L. 86-20, 5401 16th Street, N. W., the Buddhist Congregational Church of America, request for approval of construction drawings for a new entrance gate. Mr. Carson showed drawings for a new church building on this site which had been approved except for the free-standing gateway, which would overlook Rock Creek Park. Mr. Carson then showed a colored drawing of the proposed Oriental style gateway. The Secretary said the neighborhood had been very supportive of the entire project; there were no objections from the members, and the design was unanimously approved. Exhibit A

6. S.L. 86-21, 409 12th Street, S. W., proposed new office building, review of initial concept design. Mr. Carson recalled that this project had been given preliminary approval in April 1981 and was being presented again, with some changes. He said the site at 12th Street and Maryland Avenue was adjacent to the large Portal Site, soon to be developed according to a design by Arthur Cotton Moore, the architect for this project. He noted that the Commission would review the Portal Site development. He showed the members the old model for the building and drawings for the new design, pointing out changes in a side elevation that included the addition of pilasters and a balustrade, and a decrease in the depth of the dome at the corner entrance. Mr. Moore was introduced and showed slides of the Maryland Avenue axis to the Capitol and of the proposed Portal project that would reestablish the diagonal of Maryland Avenue, now obscured by railroad tracks and the fact that the avenue is discontinuous. He showed how the new building would fit into the overall plan. He said the architectural changes had come about because of a change involving a Pepco substation and because the old horizontal window pattern on the side elevations now seemed dated. He showed two versions of this elevation, both with pilasters and a balustrade, and said he preferred the one with the pilasters carried up one more level. He called this Scheme B. The members unanimously agreed this was the better of the two, and the concept design was approved. Exhibit A

7. Appendix II. Review of staff recommendations. There were no objections and the recommendations were approved.

B. District of Columbia Urban Renewal Authority

CFA 13/NOV/85-1, Phillips Flagship Restaurant, Maine Avenue, S. W., on the Washington Channel; alterations and additions to existing building, review of initial concept design. The Assistant Secretary noted that the members had seen the site and the existing building on their orientation tour. Larry Press form the District government was introduced to give the members some background information. He said the project was in the southwest urban renewal area, noting that the government had built and still owned the waterfront decks, and that private firms that leased them were required to abide by the urban renewal plan for development. He recalled that the Flagship Restaurant had opened in 1970 and had recently been sold to the Phillips family, owners of seafood restaurants in Maryland and Virginia, who wanted to enlarge the building.

The architect, Charles Tomlinson, from Wallace, Roberts & Todd continued the discussion. He said that esentially the roof form now existing would be kept, with the addition of a two-story clear glass bay at each end. Green and white striped awnings would extend over the promenades at both levels to shade outdoor diners. To add a festive air, small low-wattage lights would be strung along some awning and building edges. The Chairman questioned Mr. Tomlinson about visibility through the glass bays and light and heat control; Miss Wolf asked about the Maine Avenue facade and the appearance of the loading dock, which Mr. Tomlinson said would be closed off with a green metal gate. The only element that really concerned the members was a large, red, roof-top sign. The Secretary said the staff also had a problem with this. He said District regulations would not permit it and it was against the Commission's policy also. He told the members that building details, signs and materials would all have to be shown to the Commission at a later date. With this assurance, the concept design was unanimously approved. Exhibit B

C. Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers

CFA 13/NOV/85-2, Arlington Cemetery Visitors Center and Parking Facility; review of initial concept design. The Assistant Secretary noted that the members had visited the site on their orientation tour and told them there was a large model for them to inspect as well as drawings of the proposed plans. He said the temporary visitors center would be removed although the existing administration building would remain. The new visitors center would be located along Memorial Drive; there would be some revisions made at the end of the drive, and a parking facility would be constructed near Jefferson Davis Highway.

Mr. Evick from Arlington Cemetery was introduced and told the members that the existing visitors center had been built in 1969, was considered

temporary, and was now in need of replacement; he said a new facility had been shown on the 1976-77 master plan. He introduced architect Donald Lethbridge and asked him to discuss the proposals.

Mr. Lethbridge began by saying that no change was expected in the number of visitors to the cemetery; the new plans were intended to upgrade the facilities now existing and actually to reduce the amount of land required. He showed a site plan of the existing visitors center and parking lot and then compared it to his proposal, pointing out that the parking lot would be moved away from the cemetery and nearer to Jefferson Davis Highway and through terracing ~~had been~~ would be reduced in size by about 6 acres. The visitors center would be placed about half way along Memorial Drive on axis with the administration building. Mr. Lethbridge said that earlier plans (1964) had shown parking underneath the Memorial Drive, but costs and the advent of the Metro system had eliminated that idea. He noted also that Tourmobile service through the cemetery had become increasingly popular and the new plans included a separate Tourmobile facility. The parking area would provide for about 600 cars and 40 buses. Mr. Lethbridge said the annual visitation to Arlington Cemetery was about 5 million, with about 25,000 passing through on a peak day; of these, 2000-3000 came by Metro and that number was gradually increasing.

Mr. Lethbridge then told the members that although the Army was responsible for maintaining the cemetery, Memorial Drive was under the jurisdiction of the Park Service. He said he had worked closely with the latter agency to respond to their concerns about any intrusion into the line of white oak trees that line Memorial Drive. He said the parking and Tourmobile facilities had been moved away from the drive so that no trees would have to be removed. About six would have to be removed for the visitors center, but these could be moved rather than destroyed and used to supplement the existing trees.

Mr. Lethbridge then commented on the original plans for Memorial Drive and the gateway to the cemetery that had been developed in the 1920's and 1930's by McKim, Mead and White. He said they had not been completed, including plans for a sculptural group in the large niche at the end of the drive. While the former, very elaborate plans could not be implemented at this time, he said he was planning to construct the remaining sculptural niches along the drive according to the McKim, Mead and White spacing and to incorporate in this development the new gates for the parking area and visitors center. He noted that the guard kiosk, now near the gateway at the end of Memorial Drive, would be moved closer to the eastern entrance and visitors directed into the parking area or cemetery.

The architectural design of the two structures was then discussed. Mr. Lethbridge said the visitors center would be a classical pavilion,

in keeping with the Beaux-Arts detailing of Memorial Drive and the architecture of the Custis-Lee mansion. It would, however, have a contemporary all-glass barrel vault. The parking facility would be a simple, contemporary concrete structure with a greyish-tan granite finish. He said the visitors center would be visible only from directly opposite and the parking facility mostly from Jefferson Davis Highway. He said heavy planting would help screen the latter structure. Views were shown of the new structures from various vantage points in the surrounding area.

The Commission members were pleased with the plans in general and particularly with the design of the visitors center. Their main concern was with the visibility of the parking structure. The Chairman was worried about the light color of the concrete parking surface, noting that the roads in the cemetery were asphalt. Mr. Lethbridge said they hoped to be able to treat the concrete so that it would be dark in color. The Chairman also questioned the visibility of the glass barrel vault of the visitors center when lit from within. Mr. Lethbridge said it would be visible only through the trees and as the cemetery was not open at night this would not be a major problem. Miss Wolf asked about lighting in the parking structure and was told that there would be a minimum amount and that it would all be in the soffits. She then asked Mr. Lethbridge about visibility from Jefferson Davis Highway, and he said that the terraced layers of the structure would be seen although there would be landscaping to help screen it. The other members agreed that it would be quite visible and discussed the possibility of mounding and planting with Mr. Lethbridge. He was asked if the structure could be sunken and replied that this would not be feasible because of the high water table. He noted that the sandstone wall of the cemetery would be extended along the parking area. He introduced Mrs. Coffin, the landscape architect, to talk about the various kinds of plantings to be used; she and Mr. Lethbridge said they would bring more detailed landscape drawings at a later date. The Chairman said he thought this was very important; he particularly wanted to see more detail of what was intended along the highway, especially farther on toward the south and Columbia Pike. He said the landscaping should be part of a larger concept, not just a clump of dense green in one place. Therefore, although there were no objections to the site plan or to the design of either building, the Commission requested further detailed landscape drawings of the parking facility area before giving approval.

Exhibit C

D. Department of the Treasury, United States Mint

1. CFA 13/NOV/85-3, Vietnam Veterans Medal, revised design for obverse side; inspection of plaster model.

2. CFA 13/NOV/85-4, Lady Bird Johnson Medal; inspection of plaster model for obverse side.

Staff member Sue Kohler told the new members that the plaster models to be seen were for medals that the Commission had reviewed previously, and for which recommendations for modifications had been made. She said they were both national medals, provided for by Congressional legislation.

Mrs. Kohler said the legislation for the Vietnam Veterans Medal stipulated that there be an open competition, and participation by veterans was encouraged. The winner of the design for the obverse was, in fact, a member of the Armed Forces. She noted that the design for the reverse, basically an inscription, had already been approved. She then introduced Barry Frere from the Mint to discuss the modifications made to the obverse design. She noted that the principal request had been that something be done to differentiate the helicopter more clearly from the map of Vietnam behind it so that when reduced to medal size it would be intelligible. Mr. Frere showed the members the plaster model and said the surface of the map had been roughened by hatching to accomplish this; the members thought the solution an improvement if not entirely satisfactory. The Chairman commented on the helicopter rotor, saying it looked more like an antenna; he thought that regardless of how it looked in the photograph on which the design was based, when translated into a medal design some sense of blurred movement had to be conveyed. It was also noticed that the legs of the man jumping from the helicopter, in the foreground, had been changed so that they appeared stiff, as if he were parachuting out of an airplane rather than jumping to the ground. It was thought that the blades of rice in the background were not effective in conveying this and that a ground line might be needed. Mr. Frere was asked to convey these comments to the artists at the Mint, and in view of time constraints, was asked to bring revisions to the staff when ready. Exhibit D

Mrs. Kohler then told the new members that the Commission had approved the obverse of the Lady Bird Johnson medal in concept, but had not seen it in three-dimensional form. Mr. Frere showed them the plaster model of Mrs. Johnson's portrait, the only element on the obverse. Both the Chairman and Mrs. Regan said it did not look like Mrs. Johnson; the Chairman asked Mr. Frere to show the members a photograph of the painting on which it was based, and it was agreed that she looked too stern. He thought the problem lay primarily in the rendition of the mouth, although there seemed to be some problem with the eyes also. He suggested that another artist might try to capture the original character, as it is often difficult to change a model once finished. Mr. Frere reported, for the members' information, that four options for the reverse design were being prepared for Mrs. Johnson to see, one using a portion of the original design, another just a single flower. These will be presented to the Commission at a later date. Exhibit D

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

III. INSPECTIONS

A. General Services Administration

CFA 13/NOV/85-5, Pentagon Area Master Plan studies; review of design alternatives in process at the offices of Keyes, Condon & Florance, architects, 1320 19th Street, N. W. From approximately 3:15 to 4:00 p.m. the Commission visited the Keyes, Condon & Florance office to see numerous study drawings and a large scale model for informational purposes and an opportunity for preliminary comment. The Chairman was accompanied by Commission members: Mrs. Deaver, Mr. Hart, Mrs. Regan and Miss Wolf and by staff members Mr. Atherton and Mr. Myer. Mr. Jerry Shiplett of the General Services Administration was present as were Mr. Florance, Mr. Maves and others of the architectural firm.

A number of alternative schemes was presented, using both drawings and moveable block models. All schemes were based on adding more than three million square feet of space to the Pentagon Complex. Several schemes were based on the addition of smaller buildings around the site. One scheme would flank the adjacent Shirley Highway with a long but low serpentine structure. Another scheme proposed an additional ring of office space around the Pentagon, leaving its form intact and minimizing construction on open space.

The Commission discussed the various alternatives, feeling that new construction ought not impinge on the Arlington Ridge on the west or the boat basin to the east. They further felt that eliminating large areas of visible surface parking was desirable. There was considerable discussion of the alternatives focusing primarily on preserving the sense of open space around the Pentagon and the view along Shirley Highway as one approaches the city from the south. On balance,however, the Commission felt that adding an additional ring to the Pentagon had more promise than the alternative schemes. Though Commission members questioned the desirability of additional space at the Pentagon, they limited their discussion to the design possibilities of these additions on site. They said an inspection of the various options on site would be desirable before any further opinion could be intelligently formed.

B. Freer Gallery of Art

Inspection of proposed acquisitions. The members, with the exception of Mr. Goodman who was not present, inspected the objects and approved them for acquisition. Exhibit E

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

OLD GEORGETOWN AND SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACTIONS

Re: Items on the November 13, 1985 Meeting Agenda

EXHIBIT A

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 85-276 HPA.	907 30th Street, N. W. Mount Clare Properties, Inc.	Rosewood Hotel and and Office Building

ACTION: See attached letter to Carol Thompson dated November 27, 1985.

O.G. 85-280	3300 M Street, N. W. The Meredith Corporation	New building: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to general development concept, including building height, mass, tower element, and treatment of roof. Questions remain regarding character of detailing; design for side entrance and adjoining window openings on 33rd Street, recessed sign areas over show windows, and corner entrance to lower level should be given further study.

S.L. 86-11	3005 Oregon Knolls Drive Tidelands Construction, Inc.	New single family residence

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of a permit for the construction of a new single family frame residence with cedar shake roof as shown on drawings received and dated 1 November 1985. Action is taken at this time as a result of supplemental letters and documents which have clarified questions raised at its November 13 meeting to the Commission's satisfaction.

S.L. 86-12	3002 Oregon Knolls Drive Tidelands Construction, Inc.	New single family residence

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of a permit for the construction of a new single family frame residence with cedar shake roof as shown on drawings received and dated 1 November 1985. Action is taken at this time as a result of supplemental letters and documents which have clarified questions raised at its November 13 meeting to the Commission's satisfaction.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-13	2301 N Street, N. W. Boston Properties	New mixed-use building: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design proposed for new building. Request submission of details, construction drawings, landscape scheme and materials samples for review and approval by the Commission of Fine Arts prior to issuance of permit.

S.L. 86-17	400 1st Street, S. E. William C. Anton	Cafe enclosure

ACTION: Recommend issuance of permit.

S.L. 86-20	5401 16th Street, N. W. The Buddhist Congregational Church of America	Entrance gate to new Buddhist Church building

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed entrance gateway from Sixteenth Street. Gateway will have stuccoed piers and clay tile roof with carved wood decorative elements.

S.L. 86-21	409 12th Street, S. W. The Investment Group	New office building: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of proposed new office building. Request Scheme "B" design be developed and details refined. Final drawings to be submitted for Commission review and approval prior to issuance of permit. The Commission understands that while this proposal is submitted on behalf of a separate developer, the style and design will closely relate to the remainder of the Portal Site by the same architect, a major project yet to be reviewed. A favorable action on this present submission should not be construed as conferring general approval on the proposed Portal Site development.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT A-1

November 27, 1985

Dear Ms. Thompson:

This will confirm the Commission of Fine Arts' action at its meeting on November 13, 1985 approving the final construction documents for the Rosewood hotel and office complex at 907 30th Street, N. W. (O.G. 85-276). The designs for the new buildings and landscaping as detailed in the working drawings conform to previously approved conceptual designs, and the Commission would have no objection to the issuance of the necessary permits.

In taking this action, the Commission has accepted the letter of the Mayor of June 27, 1985 and the D. C. Council's subsequent legislative action (PR6-109) as a binding agreement for the timely transfer of existing public lands on the Georgetown waterfront to the National Park Service for purposes of establishing a new park. Our approval is also conditioned on the implementation of certain landscape improvements to be made to the east and west banks of Rock Creek, the repair of the C and O Canal Lock on the end of the mole, and the provisions for adequate public access to the Potomac shoreline from parklands to the east and west of both the Rosewood properties and the development known as Washington Harbour, and from the rights-of-way of 30th Street and Thomas Jefferson Street, N. W. on the north. Furthermore, this action does not include approval of construction of floats, wharves, fill or other features beyond the bulkhead line of the river, either in front of the Rosewood properties or the Washington Harbour site.

Finally, the selection of the exterior finish materials had not been completed by the applicants at the time of our meeting. Accordingly, samples of these materials should be made available to the Commission for review and approval prior to commencing

their placement on the structure. The brick sample should be at least a 4' x 4' panel and should be erected so it can be viewed in southern light and reasonably accessible for inspection. We look forward to seeing those samples at the appropriate time.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Ms. Carol B. Thompson
Director
Department of Consumer and
Regulatory Affairs
614 H Street, N. W., Room 307
Washington, D. C. 20001

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT A-2

November 22, 1985

Dear Mr. Pifer:

I thought I should go on record concerning our reasons for recommending the issuance of permits for two recent Shipstead cases (S.L. 86-11 and 12) reviewed by the Commission during our meeting of 13 November. Because of questions raised by a representative of the neighborhood association, the Commission deferred final comment until our next meeting scheduled in December. However, since November 13th, we have received letters and documents from the developer (Tidelands Construction) which clarify any questions we might have had. We feel that any further difference between the parties involved are not the concern of this agency and that it should not be necessary to review a second time designs already approved for earlier phases of the same development.

Sincerely,

Charles H. Atherton

Mr. Ernie Pifer, Chief
D.C. Permits Branch
614 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20002

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT B

November 27, 1985

Dear Mr. Press:

The Commission was pleased to review plans for the alterations and additions to the Flagship restaurant on the southwest waterfront at its meeting on 13 November, 1985. Most of the proposed changes will serve to enliven the presence of the restaurant and the areas immediately adjacent to it through the increased openness of the dining facilities at ground level, and the addition of elements such as awnings and special lighting to give the building a more festive air.

The Commission welcomes these changes, although we cannot approve the proposed rooftop sign displaying the Phillips name and the logo of the large red crab. As a rule rooftop signs are not recommended anywhere in the Shipstead area, and on the southwest waterfront extra care should be taken to prevent the incursion of any elements that might detract from the skyline, especially the views of the Capitol Dome as seen from East Potomac Park and the George Washington Memorial Parkway to the west.

In the same regard, we are also concerned about the silhouette lighting that will be provided by rows of small light bulbs outlining the main features of the building. For the same reason, care should be taken to ensure this lighting will in no way detract from the skyline. The bulbs should be low-wattage and spaced no more than 15" or so apart to keep the brightness within reason, and to add an extra measure of control, the lights should be on a rheostat so there can be some adjustment if needed after the installation is made.

Final construction drawings should be submitted under the Shipstead-Luce Act for Commission review. Separate sign permits should be submitted for all exterior installations, including the decorative lighting, prior to their installation.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Larry Press
Chief, Marketing & Development
D. C. Department of Housing
and Community Development
1133 North Capitol Street, N. E.
Room 400
Washington, D. C. 20002

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT C

November 27, 1985

Dear Mr. McCormick:

The Commission appreciated the opportunity at their meeting on 13 November, 1985 to review preliminary plans for the new visitors center and parking facility at Arlington National Cemetery. The present temporary visitor facilities are woefully inadequate, and we are pleased to see they will soon be replaced by something more appropriate to their setting.

As envisaged by the architect, Mr. Lethbridge, the design of the visitors center will be of a classical style in keeping with the Lee Mansion and the Tomb of the Unknowns, an approach that we agree is entirely appropriate to the character of this foremost of our national military shrines. In addition it is well sited, minimizing the visibility of the new structure from nearly all the major surrounding views, yet at the same time is accessible from public transportation from both within the cemetery and without.

The parking facility is also well located, functionally, appearing to work well from the point of view of circulation and relation to the visitors center. However, its siting on the sloping hillside in close proximity to the Jefferson Davis Highway will mean it will be visible not only from that major thoroughfare, but also from the George Washington Memorial Parkway. We are concerned about the effect the parking structure will have from these vantage points, and have asked the architect to furnish us some additional visual studies at our next meeting in order to take a closer look at the proposed design and landscaping to make sure it will be adequately screened. One thing we would not like to see is dense landscaping bunched up around the structure while at the same time leaving the areas to the south relatively open. Obviously the ideal solution would be to design the entire landscape treatment along the full eastern perimeter of the cemetery as an integrated and harmonious whole with the rest of the cemetery, and

we hope the Army's contract with the architect will permit this to be done.

There were two other aspects of the parking facility we questioned: one, the color of the pavement - it should be essentially the same color as the rest of the roadways so as to minimize the presence of the area when seen from higher spots in the cemetery, as well as from the air; two, the lighting of the interior parking spaces - under no circumstances should it be at all visible from any viewpoint. The lighting on the Arlington hillsides of the Tomb and the Lee Mansion, and the eternal flame at the Kennedy grave, is very subtle, and nothing should be allowed to distract in the slightest way from the views of these monuments.

The Commission will be meeting again on December 11 and on January 15, 1986; we would be happy to schedule further review at one of these meetings.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. William N. McCormick, Jr.
Chief, Engineering Division
Directorate of Engineering
and Construction
Washington, D. C. 20314-1000

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT D

December 5, 1985

Dear Mrs. Pope:

The Commission of Fine Arts appreciated the opportunity to look at the plaster models of the obverse of the Lady Bird Johnson and Vietnam Veterans medals at its meeting on 13 November 1985.

As we discussed with Mr. Frere, the portrait of Mrs. Johnson did not reflect the character of the painting chosen by her as a model. This seemed to be a matter of making minor adjustments, particularly to the mouth, which lacked the slight smile apparent in the painting and gave her a stern appearance.

There were several suggestions made in regard to the Vietnam Veterans medal. First, the rotor on the helicopter looked more like an antenna; however it may have appeared in the photograph on which the design was based, when rendered sculpturally some sense of the movement of the blades should be conveyed to make the image appear realistic. Secondly, the figure in the foreground was altered from the original design so that the legs appeared stiff and dangling, giving no sense of a man jumping to the ground. A return to the original concept, rendered sculpturally, would help correct this; a ground line might also be helpful as the tufts of rice do not adequately convey a feeling of solidity.

Mr. Frere noted that the texture of the map of Vietnam had been roughened somewhat to help differentiate it from the form of the helicopter, as requested previously by the Commission. This was considered an improvement, though not completely satisfactory. Both the rice paddy and the map have been difficult elements to work with, but as they were major parts of the winning design, it is probably best not to try to remove them at this point.

In view of your time constraints, it was suggested that Mr. Frere consult with the staff on revisions that would help remedy the difficulties outlined above.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable Donna Pope
Director of the Mint
Department of the Treasury
U. S. Mint
Washington, D. C. 20220

FREER GALLERY OF ART
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20560

EXHIBIT E

The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and the Commission of Fine Arts, as provided in Paragraph 4 of the Codicil to the Will of the late Charles Lang Freer, have examined the following objects:

Gifts to the Collection:

1 Annamese pottery; 13th-14th century; stoneware pillow in the form of a tortoise; concave shell creates the pillow.

1 Chinese pottery; covered vessel in form of a teapot; Chou dynasty, Warring States period, 206 B. C. - A. D. 220.

1 Chinese woodblock printed Sutra; Ming dynasty, 1368-1644; ink on paper; unmounted.

Purchases for the Collection:

1 Chinese calligraphy; Ch'ing; by Liang Ch'ing-piao and others; ink on silk; album leaves.

1 Chinese stoneware bowl; Chou dynasty, Warring States period, 481-256 B. C.

1 Japanese painting; Heian period, 794-1185; gold and Indigo on paper; handscroll; Sutra.

1 PAIR Japanese paintings; Kamakura period, 13th-14th century; Buddhist Lohans, on silk; panels.

1 Chinese pottery; Han dynasty, 206 B. C. - A. D. 220; stoneware urn with green glaze.

TELEPHONE (202) 357-2104

Transfers from the Study Collection:

4 Chinese calligraphy; Ch'ing; by Weng Tung-ho; hanging scrolls; ink on paper.

1 Japanese calligraphy; Meiji period, 19th century; by Beian; hanging scroll; ink on silk.

1 Japanese calligraphy; Edo-Meiji period, late 18th-early 19th century; Minagawa Kien; ink on paper; album.

1 Japanese pottery; early Heian period, 9th century; light grey stoneware, long-necked jar; Sanage ware.

4 Chinese pottery; Ch'ing dynasty, K'ang-hsi period, 1662-1722; vases; blue-and-white.

1 Chinese oracle bone; Shang dynasty, 1523-1028 B. C. Tortoise carapace.

1 Japanese calligraphy; Meiji period, 19th century; by Beian; hanging scroll; ink on paper.

For the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution

For the Commission of Fine Arts

MEETING:

11 December 1985